DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 481 386 SO 035 284

AUTHOR	Forest, James J. F.
TITLE	Globalisation, Universities and Professors.
PUB DATE	2003-00-00
NOTE	18p.; In: Cambridge Review of International Affairs. Carfax Publishing, Taylor & Francis Ltd., Oct 2002. v15, n3, p435-450.
AVAILABLE FROM	Carfax Publishing, Taylor & Francis Ltd, Customer Services Department, 325 Chesnut Street, 8th Floor, Philadelphia, PA 19106. Tel: 215-625-8900; Fax: 215-625-8914; e-mail: journals.orders@tandf.co.uk; Web site: http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals; Web site: http://taylorandfrancis.metapress.com.
PUB TYPE	Opinion Papers (120)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS
DESCRIPTORS	*College Faculty; Futures (of Society); Global Approach; *Globalization; *Higher Education; International Educational Exchange; *Universities
IDENTIFIERS	*Faculty Attitudes; Global Issues

ABSTRACT

Globalization has an increasingly profound impact on a broad range of human activities in political, economic, and cultural areas. From the perspective of higher education, globalization raises a number of challenges and concerns, particularly in preparing students the future leaders of commerce and politics to adequately address the demands of an ever-increasing global interdependence. Colleges and universities worldwide are responding to this challenge with an array of exchange programs and curricular initiatives. A recent international survey of the academic profession indicates that professors worldwide support these efforts. This support, however, is considerably weaker among teachers than researchers. This limited support has implications for policies and programs that focus on developing more global-minded university teachers to prepare young people to adequately meet the challenges of globalization. (Contains 6 tables and 24 notes.) (Author/BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 481 386

GLOBALISATION, UNIVERSITIES AND PROFESSORS

Dr. James JF Forest
U.S. Military Academy, West Point

Abstract

Globalisation has an increasingly profound impact on a broad range of human activities in political, economic, and cultural areas. From the perspective of higher education, globalisation raises a number of challenges and concerns, particularly in preparing students—our future leaders of commerce and politics—to adequately address the demands of an ever-increasing global interdependence. Colleges and universities worldwide are responding to this challenge with an array of exchange programs and curricular initiatives, and a recent international survey of the academic profession indicates that professors worldwide support these efforts. However, this support is considerably weaker among teachers than researchers. This has implications for policies and programs that focus on developing more globally-minded university teachers, in order to prepare our youth to adequately meet the challenges of globalisation.

126 Words

Author's Bio

Dr. James JF Forest is assistant dean for academic assessment and assistant professor of political science at the United States Military Academy, West Point, NY, USA. He has held administrative posts at several postsecondary education and non-profit organizations throughout the U.S., and has published widely on topics of teaching, learning, and technology. Recent scholarly publications include *Higher Education in the United States: An Encyclopaedia* (2 volumes, 2002: ABC-CLIO Publishers), and *University Teaching: International Perspectives* (1998: Garland Press). E-mail: James.Forest@usma.edu

79 Words

SO 035 284

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

J. Forest

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

GLOBALISATION, UNIVERSITIES AND PROFESSORS

Dr. James JF Forest
U.S. Military Academy, West Point

Although a universally acceptable definition of the term has yet to emerge, globalisation has come to describe for many observers an exponential growth in international economic, political and social networks, supported largely through advances in science and technology (and particularly in areas of transportation and information sharing).[1] While globalisation promotes increasingly open markets for the exchange of goods and services, its sphere of impact goes beyond the realm of integrated financial markets or information technologies. Indeed, these trends have also encouraged a global transfer of cultural norms, which has a profound impact on a broad range of human activities in political, economic, and cultural areas.

From the perspective of higher education, globalisation raises a number of challenges and concerns. Applied loosely in a higher education context, the term globalisation is typically used to describe a trend of institutions, faculty, and students developing an increasingly sophisticated understanding of—and salient relationships with—their counterparts worldwide.[2] Globalisation is a phenomenon to which universities both respond and contribute. Faculty research collaboration, curricular reform, research cooperation, discipline-based networks and associations, open and distance learning across frontiers, regional and cross-border institutional partnerships, international student and faculty exchange (and the related rise of international credit recognition and transfer), professional disciplinary conferences held throughout the world, and governmental policy all contribute to the relationship between globalisation and higher education. While institutions seek to enhance the quality of their students' educational experiences and ensuring the global competitiveness of their graduates, they have also historically contributed to globalisation through the increasingly fluid worldwide distribution of knowledge and ideas. The Internet offers an array of information resources previously only available in a few university libraries and laboratories, with significant implications for productive research collaborations between faculty across borders. In addition, immediate access to the perspectives and cultural values of other teachers and learners around the world has been dramatically enlarged and enriched.

The advancement of learning in all corners of the globe has become one of the most important factors affecting the human condition. Clearly, colleges and universities—and particularly professors—will be integrally involved in searching for a response to the challenges of globalisation. It is thus important to understand the views and preferences of university faculty, as they represent the most vital factor in the success or failure of any higher education institution's efforts to implement policies and programs that encompass the increasingly important global dimensions of teaching, learning, and knowledge. University professors have a critical role to play in any nation's attempts to successfully meet the current and future challenges of globalisation, not only through their research and generation of new knowledge, but also through their direct involvement in developing a nation's most important resource: an educated citizenry. Following a review of the history and recent developments in the relationship between globalisation and higher education, this article provides a brief analysis of data collected from nearly 20,000 professors worldwide, and highlights the need for university teachers to become more globally-minded in the coming decades.

Historical Impact of Globalisation on Higher Education[3]

The current era is not the first in which nations around the world have been linked in some sort of geo-economic interdependence, coupled with a significant degree of cultural fusion. According to economic scholars, the first era of globalisation took place from about the middle of the 19th century until the late 1920s, a period which saw considerable advances in the volume of trade and capital flows across borders, as well as significant growth in the flow of labour across borders. This era was dominated by the power and politics of Great Britain. Funded by a limited number of major investors throughout Europe and America, developments in transportation (e.g., railroad, steamship, and automobile) and communications (e.g., the telephone, telegraph, and transatlantic cable) made it easier and cheaper to produce and deliver goods and services around the world. The manpower needed for this industrial era came in part from large shifts of worldwide worker populations through forced and voluntary mass migrations at the end of the 19th and beginning of the 20th centuries. This era ended with the worldwide eruption of World War One, the Russian Revolution, and the Great Depression.

The impact of this era on higher education worldwide can be seen mainly in the setting up of educational systems in Asia, Africa, Oceania, and elsewhere which cloned European models, and in bringing students deemed future colonial leaders to Europe for degree studies and social training. Indeed, virtually all of the world's universities stem from the medieval European model. The very first universities were established in Paris and Bologna, and attracted students and professors from all across Europe. Much like these, modern colleges and universities in the U.S. and Europe have become increasingly international institutions, although English has replaced Latin as the common language of instruction. Even in India and China, which had their own powerful indigenous traditions of advanced learning, modern universities are Western in origin. Patterns of academic organisation, relations between professor and students, and patterns of study have all created a common academic culture worldwide.[4] Issues of access for students, accountability for teaching quality, the generation of research and scholarship, and autonomy from governmental interference are common to institutions of higher education throughout the globe.

Although universities worldwide share a common culture and reality, international education in the United States and Europe did not become an important programmatic theme at colleges and universities until after World War II and the subsequent onset of the Cold War. Foreign study and exchange opportunities—promoted by organisations formed shortly after World War I, such as the Institute of International Education (in the U.S.) and the British Council—were certainly available earlier in the century, but did not reach a broad audience, catering instead mainly to the well-to-do and gifted students of the most elite institutions and their professors.

The events of World War II and then the Cold War encouraged greater attention to learning about other countries and cultures, particularly among colleges and universities in the U.S. At the same time, the advent of the Marshall Plan, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the World Bank, and International Monetary Fund increased many nation's involvement in international affairs. Businesses began to increasingly probe international markets, and technological advances created enhanced opportunities for international travel and communication. With a global community forming, a host of new international learning options began to appear at colleges and universities. These included, among others, area

studies programs and increases in the number and types of foreign language classes and international exchange links.

Globalisation and Contemporary Higher Education

Today, market forces have supplanted Cold War politics as the world's dominant organising principle. Advances in information technology complement increasingly widespread use of air freight and global travel in supporting the cross-national integration of capital, technology, and information. This new global economy is dominated by increased mobility of labour and capital flows across borders, and the power of multinational corporations predisposed to locating their operations in countries with relatively inexpensive labour, political stability, and a business-friendly climate of low taxes, limited regulations, and the enforcement of contracts.[5] Our global inter-connectedness is characterised by the sheer number of people and countries able to partake of these connections and be affected by it. Some of the more worrisome results of modern globalisation include a relative weakening of interest in indigenous languages and their literature, while the Internet, global entertainment, and a great deal of academic scholarship is provided almost exclusively in English. Indeed, cultural diffusion is perhaps one of the most popular "dangers" of globalisation under current debate.

There are several points of intersection between higher education and modern globalisation. Universities provide highly trained manpower, while governments work closely with universities on developing new knowledge—particularly in areas of science and technology. Economic growth is significantly aided by the ownership of knowledge, protected by enforceable patents, copyrights, and licensing agreements. Recognising that a modern workforce needs a wide range of cognitive, affective, and behavioural skills necessary to live in a diversified, integrated and highly competitive world, there is a new commitment among institutions of higher education to provide international education. Universities must be increasingly responsive and effective in meeting the educational and training needs of their nation, in order to enhance their nation's ability to compete successfully in the global economy.

Beyond workforce development, higher education institutions actively pursue the frontiers of thinking, knowing, and being. As they grapple with the implications of global economic interdependence, students increasingly require expertise in synthesising contextual knowledge and the interpretation of existing and ambiguous information from an international perspective. In response, efforts to make colleges and universities more international have grown from occasional scholarly and student exchanges at the beginning of the twentieth century into a more robust set of curricular and experiential options intended to produce graduates with global competencies. Recent years have seen tremendous growth in multinational higher education, including the establishment of branch campuses by universities in other countries, collaborative degree programs between institutions across borders, and the creation of international partnerships and programs between traditional higher education institutions and new for-profit institutions and organisations. Technological advances are becoming increasingly useful in developing and maintaining these international efforts, as well as providing new methods of delivering instruction to a broad, diversified audience of learners.

The past decade has also witnessed a dramatic rise in global student and faculty participation in global exchange programs. According to the United Nations Educational, Scientific, and

Cultural Organization (UNESCO), some 15 million people annually study or teach in countries other than their own.[6] The flows of students across borders move largely from the developing countries to the industrialised nations, and many do not return home after earning the degrees, leading to some concerns over a phenomenon known as 'brain drain'. For example, 54,664 students from India studied in the United States during the 2000-2001 academic year, while Indian higher education institutions enrolled 10,000 foreign students.[7] More than ever before, students who can afford it are seeking to become as globally competent as they can be by pursuing all educational opportunities open to them, wherever they best exist. According to the Institute for International Educational Exchange, nearly 130,000 U.S. students annually head overseas for a study abroad experience, though most for relatively short sojourns.[8] As they realise that the most desirable jobs in the global job market require cross-cultural skills that can only be gained by lengthier overseas immersion, many decide to stay longer, and more will likely enrol in overseas institutions, especially as domestic costs escalate.

Study abroad participation by U.S. students may also increase as English becomes more and more the language of instruction in universities around the world. However, the number of U.S. students studying abroad pales in comparison to the foreign students who travel each year to enrol in a college or university in the U.S. Over 500,000 foreign students annually spend 3-5 years in the U.S., enrolling in economically-oriented undergraduate and graduate degree programs such as business, management, engineering, and computer science.[9] The large majority come from developing countries—55 percent from Asia, for example—while just 15 percent of foreign students in the U.S. come from Europe.[10]

But while the number of students who study in the United States is about twice as large as those going to any other country, UNESCO data reveal that the 'market share' of American colleges and universities has declined from 40 percent, 10 years ago.[11] Competition for international students—who are now searching for their postsecondary educational experiences in a global marketplace—has increased and will continue to do so. While the U.S. is still the leader in foreign student participation, many other countries have recently developed or expanded their higher education opportunities for foreign students. Programs in Europe, including ERASMUS and SOCRATES, aim to increase the mobility of students and professors across national borders, and several English-speaking countries—particularly Britain, Canada and Australia—have launched substantial recruiting efforts in Asia and elsewhere. France created a new agency—EDUFRANCE—to lure students from abroad, while Germany charges foreign students the same minimal tuition rates that its own citizens pay, and is increasingly offering graduate programs taught in English.

While academic programs and student/faculty international exchanges are the most common forms of university responses to globalisation, recent decades have seen a number of new developments. With increased global interconnectedness—and most importantly, the Internet—colleges and universities have enormous opportunities to serve increasing numbers of students in other countries. Many institutions have established branch campuses and programs in foreign countries. For example, New York University opened a campus in Italy during the 1990s, and in 1991 the University of Michigan opened a U.S.-designed MBA program in Hong Kong. Both Australia and Britain have been especially active in establishing transnational programs. More than 140,000 international students are involved in academic programs under the auspices of British universities elsewhere in the world.[12] Britain is also responding to globalisation by increasing the number of overseas students in

U.K. universities and developing relationships with foreign institutions. The Middle East has also witnessed the emergence of offshore campuses and virtual higher education throughout the region (particularly in Lebanon, Kuwait, and the United Arab Emirates). For example, a new Arab Open University was recently established with its headquarters in Kuwait and six campuses in six different countries. In India, universities from other countries have established more than 200 academic programs, currently enrolling 30,000 students.[13]

From these global trends a growing concern has emerged that the content and range of academic experiences offered by institutions of higher education must be modified to ensure that students become globally competent and able to compete for the most desirable jobs in the global marketplace. All national academic systems may be to some degree provincial, having evolved to provide a knowledge base and training that served the domestic economy and provided training for national socialisation and citizenship. However, it is increasingly hard to find any kind of work which is not in some way related to broader global realities. Employers, both domestic and in other countries, are demanding from potential employees not only substantive knowledge but cross-cultural skills. Universities must offer coursework and an extracurricular environment that will educate students for the world that is now and will be, not the world that has been. To many observers, the key challenge in developing a global-oriented learning environment rests in convincing professors to embrace an increasingly international dimension in their research and teaching.

University Professors and Globalisation: Unique Challenges for the 21st Century

As ambassadors and implementers of a nation's higher education goals, professors warrant particular attention in examining academic responses to globalisation. Clearly, events associated with globalisation have also fostered a more professionally connected, international community of scholars and scientists, and recent studies of the academic profession have revealed a deep conviction among faculty that higher education is an international enterprise and that the academic profession is becoming a more global community.[14] In one study, the Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching conducted a survey of nearly 20,000 professors worldwide. The architects of this research project felt that an international study of this kind would yield key insights on important issues of higher education and the academic profession. Fifteen nations collaborated in the survey: Australia, Brazil, Chile, Egypt, Germany, Hong Kong, Israel, Japan, Korea, Mexico, The Netherlands, Russia, Sweden, the United Kingdom, and the United States.[15] The questionnaire included more than two hundred items, capturing faculty opinions and information about many of the issues and trends most crucial to higher education: student access and excellence; professional activities including teaching, research, and service; basic demographic information concerning the professoriate; working conditions; institutional governance issues; and the role of higher education in society.

The resulting international collection of data provides a unique and powerful source of information for our understanding of college and university professors, and indicate that there is indeed an international academic profession with common perspectives and concerns, common problems and challenges.[16] The survey also included several questions related to the international dimensions of higher education, yielding a number of interesting findings for our understanding of professors and globalisation. For the purposes of this discussion, only a few issues will be presented here: international academic connections, foreign scholarship, and globalising the curriculum.

1. International Connections Among Professors

It is widely agreed that the distribution of information and knowledge has reached new cross-national dimensions, and that an international network has proven quite useful for research and institutional collaboration. The Carnegie study thus sought to determine whether professors consider international connections with their colleagues important. The survey results were generally encouraging, as a majority of professors surveyed indicate that contacts with scholars outside their countries are important for their professional work (Table 1).

Table 1

International views of professors regarding the statement: 'Connections with scholars in other countries are very important to my professional work'.

Country	(Respondents)	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Australia	(1,420)	81%	15%	4%
Brazil	(989)	85	11	4
Chile	(1,071)	95	3	2
Germany	(2,801)	78	14	8
Hong Kong	(471)	85	12	4
Israel	(502)	86	8	6
Japan	(1,889)	88	11	2
Korea	(903)	91	8	1
Mexico	(1,027)	79	15	6
The Netherlands	(1,364)	81	11	8
Russia	(438)	89	11	1
Sweden	(1,122)	87	11	2
United Kingdom	(1,946)	63	26	11
United States	(3,529)	55	26	19

Source: International Survey of the Academic Profession, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching.

However, survey responses to this question varied across countries in a distinct pattern, with professors in the United States and the United Kingdom showing the lowest support for international scholarly connections. This may not be all that surprising when considering the relative dominance of these countries in professional conference markets and scholarly journal publishing. The survey data thus suggest that perhaps professors in the U.S. and U.K. need new encouragement or incentives to develop international connections in academe, as there is much the West can learn from academic developments abroad. According to the survey data, professors also feel that colleges and universities should do more to promote opportunities for students and faculty to study or teach in other countries, although here too, support for this was considerably lower among professors in the United States. In fact, throughout this international study of the academic profession, professors in the United States were significantly less likely than their colleagues elsewhere to express interest in learning from, contributing to, or otherwise actively participating in the international academic community. This pattern of survey responses raises questions for institutional leaders and policymakers throughout the U.S. in developing appropriate responses to globalisation.

Upon further examination of the Carnegie survey data, several additional patterns of interest emerge related to a faculty member's preference for teaching or conducting research.[17] As professors must typically choose whether to focus the lion's share of their time and energy toward being a teacher or being a researcher, this issue of work preferences is arguably

important for the study of any profession, and reflects the perception of a professional occupation held by its members—in this case, for example, whether a faculty member introduces herself as a Biologist or as a professor at Eastern State University. In an early study of the academic profession, sociologist Alvin Gouldner proposed that professors of major research universities can be identified as either 'cosmopolitans' or 'locals'—cosmopolitans are those professors who identify more strongly with their academic disciplines than with their institutions, while locals are professors whose loyalties are directed more towards their institutions than their disciplines.[18] Gouldner suggested that the further an individual's professional focus moves from research toward teaching, the more that individual is likely to pursue local activities and to identify more closely with his or her institution.

Indeed, several other studies of the academic profession have shown that professors who prefer to teach do in fact teach more than their research-oriented colleagues, and those who prefer to engage in research do more of that than teach. This has direct implications for a discussion of globalisation in the context of higher education—if faculty are engaged in international activities solely for the purposes of research and not teaching, just how well are they preparing their students for the globally interdependent marketplace of employment and ideas? From this perspective it is useful to raise the question, do teaching-oriented professors view the international dimensions of higher education differently than their research-oriented colleagues? According to the data collected by this international survey, they do indeed (see Table 2).

Table 2

Are teaching-oriented professors more or less likely than research-oriented professors to agree with the statement, 'Connections with scholars in other countries are very important to my professional work'?

MORE Likely	LESS likely		No Significant Relationship
	Brazil	r = -.17	Australia
	Chile	r = -.17	Russia
	Germany	r = -.19	
	Hong Kong	r = -.21	
	Israel	r = -.26	
	Japan	r = -.13	
	Korea	r = -.10	
	Mexico	r = -.20	
	the Netherlands	r = -.26	
	Sweden	r = -.22	
	United Kingdom	r = -.31	
	United States	r = -.26	

Source: International Survey of the Academic Profession, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. All correlations shown are at the $p < .05$ level of significance.

According to this survey, teachers in most countries surveyed appear substantially less interested in global academic connections than researchers. Why is this? Perhaps there are significantly fewer incentives or opportunities for teaching-oriented professors to develop connections with their colleagues in other countries. If this is so, however, there are implications to consider in terms of classroom instruction and student learning, as a crucial global dimension of knowledge and understanding goes largely ignored. Clearly, international connections among academics can enhance the breadth and scope of knowledge

from which a teacher can draw upon in lectures and classroom discussions. Our understanding of the academic responsibility of teaching needs to encompass an international dimension, in order for our students—and our colleagues—to adequately address the demands of increasing global interdependence. As British scholar W.H. Taylor observed, 'the young need to be educated to realise how much of their lives will be determined by transnational forces'.[19] For the sake of a nation's future, governmental policies should compel, university teachers to recognize and convey to their students the importance of a global perspective.

2. Foreign Books and Journals

Academic institutions are linked across international boundaries by an international knowledge network that communicates research worldwide through books, journals, and increasingly, databases.[20] As academic international connections foster and grow most usually within disciplinary contexts, professors have an increasing need to read books and journals published beyond their nation's borders. To be sure, the perceived value of reading books and journals published abroad can vary considerably depending on faculty interests, discipline, and especially geographic location. Faculty employed by universities in the developing world find themselves at a disadvantage in the international knowledge network.[21] The Western world—and Western language—completely dominates the published world, which leads to a significant disadvantage for professors elsewhere. Faculty in the United States have relatively less incentive than (for example) their Latin American colleagues to read books and journals published abroad, for the simple fact that there are far more books published in the U.S. than in all of Latin America.

Perhaps this explains why, in all countries except the United States, more than 90 percent of faculty feel that a scholar or scientist must read books and journals published abroad to keep up with his or her discipline (Table 3). Such overwhelming support for this is certainly indicative of the growing influence of globalisation.

Table 3

International views of professors regarding the statement: 'In order to keep up with developments in my discipline, a scholar must read books and journals published abroad'.

Country	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Australia	98%	2%	1%
Brazil	92	3	4
Chile	98	1	1
Germany	91	5	4
Hong Kong	98	1	1
Israel	98	2	0
Japan	93	5	2
Korea	96	4	1
Mexico	91	6	3
The Netherlands	95	3	3
Russia	99	1	0
Sweden	96	3	1
United States	62	17	22

Source: International Survey of the Academic Profession, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. This item was omitted from the survey administered in the United Kingdom.

It is rather instructive that less than two-thirds of U.S. professors surveyed feel the need to read books and journals published abroad. When examined in the larger context of curricular offerings and student enrolment patterns, an image emerges of higher education in the United States that appears relatively dismissive of global dimensions of knowledge. For example, enrolments in foreign language courses have dropped from 16 percent to 8 percent in recent years, and relatively few American students study non-traditional languages: Middle Eastern languages are taken by fewer than 2 percent and Spanish is now the dominant foreign language.[22] As indicated earlier, the U.S. is home to only 130,000 of the roughly 15 million students abroad, while over three times as many students come to the U.S. from other countries to earn their university degrees.[23] These and other trends seem to reflect a rather insular view of the world, with the U.S. in the centre and other countries relegated to distant points on the periphery. This may be a reflection of the dominance of U.S. firms in the scholarly publishing and professional conference markets. Indeed, the American professoriate is at the centre of an international knowledge network which has unfortunately fostered a unique American academic research system in which scholars and scientists remain remarkably insular in their attitudes and their activities.[24]

Beyond the domains of research and science, however, it is even more important to analyse the impact of this relative insularity on faculty approaches to classroom instruction. As observed earlier, teachers tend to view the global dimension of higher education differently than researchers. Thus, it is perhaps unsurprising to discover that teaching-oriented faculty in the U.S. appear even less interested in reading foreign scholarship than their research-oriented colleagues. Further, this pattern holds true for faculty in almost all the countries surveyed (see Table 4).

Table 4

Are teaching-oriented professors more or less likely than their research-oriented colleagues to agree with the statement, 'A scholar must read books and journals published abroad'?

MORE Likely	LESS likely		No Significant Relationship
	Australia	r = -.30	Hong Kong
	Brazil	r = -.19	Russia
	Chile	r = -.14	
	Germany	r = -.24	
	Israel	r = -.20	
	Japan	r = -.11	
	Korea	r = -.06	
	Mexico	r = -.15	
	the Netherlands	r = -.17	
	Sweden	r = -.24	
	United States	r = -.27	

Source: International Survey of the Academic Profession, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. This item was omitted from the survey administered in the United Kingdom. All correlations shown are at the $p < .05$ level of significance.

These data raise an important issue: do teaching-oriented professors feel they have little to gain by reading foreign scholarship, and if so, why? By failing to incorporate the scholarship of colleagues in other countries, university teachers and their students are missing out on a great deal of insights and knowledge that can help the leaders of tomorrow gain a more global perspective. It seems intuitive that if university teachers are to be entrusted with preparing globally-competent future leaders, we should encourage more consideration of books and journals published abroad. This notion of developing global competency among students is particularly salient when addressing issues of curriculum development and delivery. Indeed, there has never been a greater need for global perspective in our classrooms.

3. Globalising the Curriculum

The primary teaching activities of many institutions worldwide are organized around a curriculum of some kind, although the term *curriculum* does not garner the same definition cross-nationally. In countries with similar higher education systems as the U.S., discipline-based curricula are developed for particular stages of the higher education process, with basic review or 'survey' courses provided in early undergraduate years, and more advanced research skills development courses and in-depth explorations of a particular topic are offered in graduate programs, or possibly the senior undergraduate years. In other countries, such as Germany, there is limited or no advanced study by coursework at all. In most countries, these learning sequences and course patterns are often regulated more closely in public education than in the private sector.

Recent decades have seen increasing diversification and specialisation of higher education curricula, and there has been consistent pressure from the business community—as well as from members of the academic community—to make curricula more relevant to the skills needed in the job market. Above all, despite variations on the theme, there is a widespread belief that student success beyond graduation is influenced in some way by their institution's curriculum. Thus colleges and universities have been increasingly called upon to develop the kinds of curricula that provide students with a reasonably useful sense of the world around

them. Clearly, our understanding of academic responsibilities must encompass an international dimension, in order for our students–and our colleagues–to adequately address the demands of increasing global interdependence. With this in mind, the Carnegie data provide a positive sign by revealing that professors in most of the countries surveyed are convinced that the curriculum should be more international in scope (Table 5). In the United States, faculty are particularly concerned about the foreign language and area studies dimensions to their curriculum.

Table 5

International views of professors regarding the statement:
'The curriculum at this institution should be more international in focus'.

	Agree	Neutral	Disagree
Australia	47%	40%	13%
Brazil	61	22	17
Chile	79	12	9
Germany	57	31	12
Hong Kong	66	27	7
Israel	29	32	39
Japan	67	31	2
Korea	76	20	4
Mexico	75	17	8
Russia	59	39	3
Sweden	59	34	7
United States	45	37	18

Source: International Survey of the Academic Profession, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. This item was omitted from the survey administered in the Netherlands and the United Kingdom.

In Australia, Israel and the United States, less than half of the professors surveyed were in agreement with this statement, while the opposite trend was found in the other countries surveyed. It stands to reason that policymakers and researchers might find some value in delving deeper into potential reasons why support for an international curriculum is relative low among their professors in these countries. Perhaps internationalising a university's curriculum in these countries is particularly fraught with incredibly difficulties. Or perhaps the faculty in these countries already believe their curricular offerings to be suitably international in their current form. Further study of these questions may yield useful insights into how colleges and universities can better provide students with a set of learning experiences through which they will improve their understanding of the world and develop a sophisticated orientation toward particular components of the world system.

Since teaching-oriented professors are more concerned with classroom instruction and student learning than their research-oriented colleagues, one would expect that the idea of an internationalised curriculum would be relatively more important for university teachers than for researchers. However, in light of the previous discussion regarding the tendency of teaching-oriented faculty to view international exposure as largely irrelevant to their work, it is perhaps unsurprising to find that in several countries surveyed, teaching professors hold relatively insular views regarding curriculum development (see Table 6).

Table 6

Are teaching-oriented professors more or less likely than their research-oriented colleagues to agree with the statement, 'The curriculum at this institution should be more international in focus'?

MORE Likely		LESS likely		No Significant Relationship
Israel	r = .02	Australia	r = -.02	Hong Kong
Mexico	r = .08	Brazil	r = -.09	Japan
		Chile	r = -.10	Russia
		Germany	r = -.07	Sweden
		Korea	r = -.04	
		United States	r = -.05	

Source: International Survey of the Academic Profession, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. This item was omitted from the survey administered in the United Kingdom. All correlations shown are at the $p < .05$ level of significance.

Indeed, this international survey of faculty revealed that in many of the countries surveyed, research professors–those less likely than their colleagues to engage in classroom teaching–were more likely than teaching professors to support the notion of internationalising the curriculum. Perhaps this supports the suggestion made earlier that the international dimensions of higher education are by and large the domain of the researcher, while our institutions have yet to engage teachers and students more fully in developing a global perspective of knowledge. This poses an important dilemma, when considering that teaching-oriented faculty are those who are most likely to teach, and thus are more likely to have a more vocal involvement with curriculum policies at their institution. If we are to effectively rise to the challenges of our increasingly global environment, we must find ways to change the perspectives of our teaching-oriented faculty so that they are more supportive of an international focus in the curriculum. In an increasingly interconnected world, the advancement of learning has become one of the most influential factors affecting the human condition. Our colleges and universities must develop the kinds of curricula that provide students with a reasonably useful sense of the world around them. How we communicate the values of globalism to future generations of leaders is one of the most important challenges of the 21st Century.

Conclusion and Implications

Through an increasingly fluid international flow of information, capital, ideas, technologies, people, and values, globalisation has a direct and important relationship with higher education institutions worldwide. Globalisation has clearly altered traditional ways of thinking, knowing, and working. Since these things are central to higher education, the impact of globalism on what colleges and universities do is already profound, and there is much more to come. University professors have a critical role to play in any nation's attempts to successfully meet the current and future challenges of globalisation, not only through their research and generation of new knowledge, but in also through their direct involvement in developing a nation's most important resource—an educated citizenry. While there is considerable public debate on the need for institutions of higher education to develop effective responses to globalisation, little has yet been mentioned about the critical role of professors in these efforts.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

The findings of the Carnegie international study of faculty provide insight into how professors see the world and their place in it. Overall, these data suggest that professors in most countries have a keen interest in the international dimensions of higher education. However, the data also indicate that researchers are conspicuously more globally-oriented than teachers. Perhaps this finding is not that surprising—teaching is basically an activity located within the institution, and is evaluated according to institutional guidelines of quality, whereas academic research is an activity generated primarily for the consumption of those outside the institution, and is thus compared with external measures of quality. Thus research scholars have more incentive than their teaching-oriented colleagues to build international relationships within their academic disciplines. In comparison, there appear to be few compelling reasons for teaching-oriented faculty to develop or maintain connections with their colleagues abroad or to pursue other international dimensions to their work, unless for reasons of personal curiosity.

However, colleges and universities face a unique challenge of encouraging their teaching-oriented professors to pursue a more global dimension in their work, most importantly in their curricular development and classroom instruction. University teachers play a prominent role in preparing future generations of leaders, through their classroom activities and developing their institution's curriculum. Perhaps universities should consider rewarding teachers who incorporate an international dimension in their classroom materials and instruction. For example, we could offer greater opportunities for teaching-oriented professors to travel abroad and participate in collaborative transnational teaching activities. Currently most international exchange programs are focused more on generating research than engaging in transnational teaching. Indeed, very few programs exist which encourage teachers to go abroad to teach.

Faculty exchange programs, such as the world-renowned Fulbright program in the United States, typically pick recipients largely by scholarly reputation rather than anything related to their classroom instructional activities. To be sure, this is changing in some parts of the world. Perhaps the most famous current examples are the SOCRATES and ERASMUS programs in Europe, which provide teaching fellowships to stimulate the creation of new teaching materials and to support academics with exceptional abilities and teachers in developing a European dimension in their field.[25] Certainly, more opportunities for teaching-oriented professors to work abroad would have a considerable impact on their understanding of higher education and their academic discipline, and lead to a greater appreciation of globalisation—an appreciation which would then inform their teaching in ways that their students would surely benefit from.

Issues of language, economic and political cooperation, and social understanding require an international perspective among professors, students, and society at large. If significant opportunities are not provided for teaching-oriented professors to travel or work abroad, this can have negative implications for our efforts to internationalise our classrooms and our institutions—the arenas in which the loyalties of teaching-oriented professors are strongest. Overall, higher education institutions worldwide are responding to globalisation, and professors seem to be generally supportive. However, important challenges remain on an institutional, national, and regional level. To enable our societies to respond effectively to the challenges of globalisation, we must universally strengthen faculty support for—and connections within—the international dimensions of higher education. Most importantly, we must find ways to encourage university teachers to recognize the important global

dimensions of learning in ways that will enable future generations to be successful in an increasingly global marketplace. How a nation's colleges and universities approach these issues of faculty and the international dimensions of knowledge will certainly have lasting affects on their relative success in responding to the challenges of globalisation.

6,975 Words (including endnotes)

NOTES

[1] For more in-depth analysis of globalisation, please see UNESCO's *International Flows of Selected Cultural Goods, 1980-1998*, Montreal, UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2000; The Economist's *Globalisation: Making Sense of an Integrating World*, London, co-published by Profile Books and *The Economist*, 2002; and the chapter by William Hoffa and James Forest in the forthcoming *Higher Education In the United States: An Encyclopaedia*, New York, ABC-CLIO Press, 2002.

[2] For in-depth discussion on the impact of globalisation on higher education, please see: Hans de Wit, *Internationalisation of Higher Education in the United States of America and Europe: A Historical, Comparative, and Conceptual Analysis*, Westport, CT, Greenwood Publishers, *2002*; Peter Scott, ed., *The Globalisation of Higher Education*, Buckingham, Open University Press, 1998; and the chapter by William Hoffa and James Forest in the forthcoming *Higher Education In the United States: An Encyclopaedia*, New York, ABC-CLIO Press, 2002.

[3] Portions of this discussion will appear in a chapter by William Hoffa and James Forest in the forthcoming *Higher Education In the United States: An Encyclopaedia*, New York, ABC-CLIO Press, 2002.

[4] Philip G. Altbach, *Comparative Higher Education: Knowledge, the University, and Development*, Chestnut Hill, Boston College Centre for International Higher Education, 1997.

[5] The Economist, *Globalisation: Making Sense of an Integrating World*, London, co-published by Profile Books and *The Economist*, 2002

[6] UNESCO, *2001 Annual Statistical Yearbook*, Montreal, UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2001

[7] K. B. Powar, ed., *Internationalisation of Indian Higher Education*, New Delhi, Association of Indian Universities, 2001.

[8] Institute for Educational Exchange data, published in *Open Doors 2001*, New York, IIE, 2001

[9] Institute for Educational Exchange data, published in *Open Doors 2001*, New York, IIE, 2001

[10] Institute for Educational Exchange data, published in *Open Doors 2001*, New York, IIE, 2001

[11] UNESCO, *2001 Annual Statistical Yearbook*, Montreal, UNESCO Institute for Statistics, 2001

[12] United Kingdom Council for International Education, *Student Mobility on the Map: Tertiary Education Interchange in the Commonwealth on the Threshold of the 21st Century*, London, UKCOSA, 2000.

[13] K. B. Powar, ed., *Internationalisation of Indian Higher Education*, New Delhi, Association of Indian Universities, 2001.

[14] Philip G. Altbach and Lionel Lewis, 'The Academic Profession in International Perspective', in Philip G. Altbach, ed., *The International Academic Profession: Portraits of 14 Countries*, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1996, p. 41

[15] Responses indicated by "Germany" and "Korea" were in fact only collected from faculty in West Germany and South Korea. Also, Egypt did not provide complete data results of their survey to the Carnegie Foundation, and have thus been excluded from any comparative analyses of the data. For more information on this survey, please see: James J. F. Forest, *I Prefer To Teach: An International Study of Faculty Preference for Teaching over Research*, RoutledgeFalmer Press, 2002, pp. 51-62.

[16] Ernest L. Boyer, 'Foreword', in Philip G. Altbach, ed., *The International Academic Profession: Portraits of 14 Countries*, Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching, 1996, p. xv

[17] For a thorough study of faculty preferences, see a recently published volume by this author: James J. F. Forest, *I Prefer To Teach: An International Study of Faculty Preference for Teaching over Research*, RoutledgeFalmer Press, 2002.

[18] Alvin W. Gouldner, 'Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an analysis of latent social roles', *Administrative Sciences Quarterly* 2, 1957, p. 281-306.

[19] William H. Taylor, 'Educating British Children for European Citizenship', *European Journal of Education* 28(4), 1993, p. 439.

[20] Philip G. Altbach, 'The New Internationalism: Foreign Students and Scholars,' in Philip G. Altbach, *Comparative Higher Education: Knowledge, the University, and Development*, Boston College Centre for International Higher Education, 1997, p. 207

[21] Philip G. Altbach, 'The University as Centre and Periphery', in Philip G. Altbach, *Comparative Higher Education: Knowledge, the University, and Development*, Boston College Centre for International Higher Education, 1997, p. 29

[22] Fred M. Hayward and Laura M. Siaya, *Public Experience, Attitudes, and Knowledge: A Report on Two National Surveys about International Education*, Washington, DC, American Council on Education, 2001

[23] Institute for Educational Exchange data, published in *Open Doors 2001*, New York, IIE, 2001

[24] Philip G. Altbach, *Comparative Higher Education: Knowledge, the University, and Development*, Boston College Centre for International Higher Education, 1997, p. 114-129

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

[25] Hans de Witt, 'European Internationalisation Programs' *International Higher Education* 2, 1996, p. 2

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

SO 035284

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Globalization, Universities and Professors	
Author(s): James Forest	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 2005

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ↑

☐

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) *and* paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ↑

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ↑

☑

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: [signature]	Printed Name/Position/Title: James Forest, Asst. Dean
Organization/Address: USMA, Taylor Hall, rm. 10 MAOM-AAD, West Point, NY 10996	Telephone: 845-938-2715 FAX:
	E-Mail Address: Date: 9/16/03

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor: Cambridge Review of International Affairs
Address: University of Cambridge 32 Trumpington Street Cambridge CB2 1QY. UK
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC/CHESS
2805 E. Tenth Street, #120
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)